



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

by Professor Macurdy (Grace Harriet) credited to "l'Harriet" (p. 62). But we can afford to be amused rather than irritated at such things, and may remind ourselves that many of us in this country do not keep up with Italian publications as we should.

THOMAS D. GOODELL

YALE UNIVERSITY

Die Spürhunde des Sophokles. Von U. von WILAMOWITZ-MOELLEN-DORFF. Sonderabdruck aus dem XXIX. Bande der neuen Jahrbücher für das Klassische Alterthum. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 1.

Professor von Wilamowitz assisted Hunt in the construction of the text of the new fragments of Sophocles, and, after waiting for Hunt to publish, now gives to the public his own interpretations.

The tragic fragments he holds to be undoubtedly Sophoclean and refers them to a tragedy *Eurypylos* already divined by Tyrwhitt. The long fragment descriptive of Priam's lament for Eurypylos he quotes and interprets with observations on the style which are much needed to reconcile us to the Sophoclean authorship of some of these lines. When, for instance, Priam seems to speak of the dead Eurypylos as τὸν παῖδα τὸν γέροντα τὸν νεανίαν, it is surely reading a great deal into γέροντα to interpret it by Aeschylus' γέροντα τὸν νοῦν σάρκα δ' ἡβώσαν φέρει. The third line νεκρῷ διδόντες οὐδὲν ὠφελουμένῳ he rejects as tasteless and obviously spurious. But may it not be defended by *Iliad* xxii. 513: οὐδὲν σοί γ' ὄφελος? In the last four lines

χρόνον ξενωθείς οὐ μακρὸν πολλῶν [δ' ἐτῶν]
 μνήμην παρέξεις τοῖς [λελειμμέν]οις [δορός]
 ὅσ' οὔτε Μέμνων οὔτε Σαρπηδὼν ποτε]
 π[έν]θη π[ο]θήσας κ[αί]περ αἰχμ[ή]ντων ἄκροι

I would suggest that we place a comma after παρέξεις and construe the following dative with π[έν]θη π[ο]θήσας, for which, if space allows, it would perhaps be better to substitute πένθη παρασχών (Aeschyl. *Persae* 322, Σάρδεσιν|πένθος παρασχών), reading also, perhaps, οἷπερ for καίπερ.

The *Ἰχνηταὶ Σάτυροι*, of which some four hundred lines have been rescued, deals with the theme of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes. Wilamowitz plausibly reconstructs the plot and quotes and interprets the chorus' quest for the cattle and Cyllene's teasing speech. From the style he infers that the play belongs to the earlier period of Sophocles' *πικρὸν καὶ κατὰ τεχνον* manner. He confirms this conclusion by the absence of three speakers and of ἀντιλαβή, and the suggestion that Sophocles himself may have played the part of Hermes which he would hardly have done except as a youth.

The fact that the *ἰχνευταί* are most naturally conceived as a pack of hounds, and Silenos, who is not explicitly named, as their hunt-master, leads to an interesting discussion of the whole vexed question of Satyrs and Silens on the Athenian stage, which there is no space to summarize. I am pleased to see that in Aeschylus fr. 207: *τράγος γένειον ἄρα πενθήσεις σύ γε*, Professor von Wilamowitz agrees that the nominative cannot be taken as vocative. But he tries to "save his goat" by assimilating the construction to that of Sophocles fr. 182: *ἐρινὸς ἄλλους ἐξερινάζεις λόγῳ*. The text of this is doubtful. But even if we accept Wilamowitz' text, surely the point of the line lies in the etymologizing pun and teasing repetition of *ἐρινός* in *ἐξερινάζεις*. There is nothing of this in *τράγος γένειον*, which, as I tried to show in *Class. Phil.*, IV, 433, belongs grammatically and idiomatically in the category of *rusticus exspectat* and *κύων ἐπέρησα χαράδρην*.

The latter part of the essay gives Wilamowitz' present views of the origin of the Greek drama. The vaticinations of the English folklorist school are rejected *in toto* (p. 24): "*petitio principii* und schillernde Möglichkeiten sind üble Surrogate des Beweises." He insists particularly upon their hopeless confusion of conjectural prehistoric religion in any part of the world with the actual development of the drama in Attica. It is this last which we wish to know; and it is this which we must presume Aristotle to have known even when he neglects to tell us the details. There remains the difficulty of transition from the *λέξις γελοία* and saltatory trochaic tetrameter of "satyric" tragedy to Aeschylus' mighty line. Wilamowitz cuts rather than unties the knot by the personal genius of Aeschylus and an eloquent appeal to the mutation theory of evolution in botany and the Carlylean gospel of the great man in history. The footnotes throughout this pregnant and suggestive paper teem with ideas which no student of the Greek drama can afford to overlook.

PAUL SHOREY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Der Orient und die frühgriechische Kunst. VON FREDERIK POULSEN.
Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. Pp. vi+195, with 196 illustrations
in the text. M. 12.

Poulsen's purpose in this book, as he himself states it (p. 3), is to show "how the Greek orientalizing style came into being." His method is to analyze carefully a large number of works of the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries B.C., especially works of minor art, and by this means to attempt to determine the elements of the orientalizing style and to trace them back to their origin in Egyptian, Assyrian, Hittite, and Phoenician art.

Such a book is impossible to criticize in detail in the brief limits of a review. The validity of the argument depends, in almost every case, on